



**Legislative Department
Seattle City Council
Memorandum**

Date: July 24, 2013

To: Richard Conlin, Chair
Tim Burgess, Vice Chair
Mike O'Brien, Member
Planning, Land Use and Sustainability Committee (PLUS)

From: Eric McConaghy, Council Central Staff

Subject: Comprehensive Plan – Docket Recommendations

Introduction

With a few limited exceptions, the Council may amend the Comprehensive Plan once a year. Council's review process will culminate next spring with a vote on a bill amending the Comprehensive Plan. Resolution 31402 sets out the criteria for including proposed amendments in an annual review cycle. Resolution 31117 addresses the adoption process.

Generally, the process occurs in two steps. First, in the summer the Council reviews amendment applications and establishes by resolution a docket of the amendments the Council will consider. This is often referred to as the "docket setting" resolution. Second, in the spring of the following year, after Department of Planning and Development (DPD) review and environmental analysis, Council considers the merits of proposed amendments and acts on a bill amending the Comprehensive Plan.

This memorandum: 1) sets out the criteria Council uses to determine whether the nine proposed amendments should be included in the docket setting resolution and 2) discusses proposed amendments and the recommendations of DPD, the Planning Commission, and Central Staff.

Selection Criteria for Annual Comprehensive Plan

The Council applies a variety of criteria in deciding whether to include a proposed amendment in the docket setting resolution. A decision to include a proposed amendment in the resolution does not constitute Council approval of a proposed amendment. Rather, a decision to include a proposed amendment means that the Council has determined that the subject matter is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan and consideration of the proposed amendment can be practically accomplished during the amendment cycle. Criteria applied by the Council are as follows:

- A. The amendment is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan because:
1. It is consistent with the role of the Comprehensive Plan under the State Growth Management Act;
 2. It is consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and the multi-county policies contained in the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040 strategy;
 3. Its intent cannot be accomplished by a change in regulations alone;
 4. It is not better addressed as a budgetary or programmatic decision; and
 5. It is not better addressed through another process, such as neighborhood planning.

- B. The amendment is legal under state and local law.
- C. It is practical to consider the amendment because:
 - 1. The timing of the amendment is appropriate and Council will have sufficient information to make an informed decision;
 - 2. City staff will be able to develop within the time available the text for the Comprehensive Plan and, if necessary, amendments to the Municipal Code, and to conduct sufficient analysis and public review;
 - 3. The amendment is consistent with the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy, or the Mayor or Council wishes to consider changing the vision or established policy; and
 - 4. The amendment has not been recently rejected by the City Council.
- D. If the amendment would change a neighborhood plan, it either is the result of a neighborhood review process or can be reviewed by such a process prior to final Council consideration of the amendment.
- E. The amendment is likely to make a material difference in a future City regulatory or funding decision.

Work to Date

On June 28, DPD staff and Central Staff briefed PLUS regarding the nine proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments for consideration in during the 2013-14 amendment cycle. On July 11, PLUS heard public comment on the proposed amendments. On July 12, the Planning Commission provided to PLUS their comments and recommendations on the proposed amendments.

Staff Recommendations

The docket setting resolution was introduced on June 24, and will be the subject of a vote at PLUS's meeting on July 24. The resolution includes all nine of the proposed amendments. PLUS may amend the docket setting resolution in order to include fewer than all nine of the proposed amendments. Central staff recommends the inclusion of seven amendments, removal of one of the amendments, and the inclusion of one amendment with particular concerns.

The table on the following pages summarizes the proposed amendments and the recommendations of the Planning Commission, DPD, and Central Staff. For seven of the amendments, there are unanimous recommendations to include the proposal in the docket.

For amendment #8, there is a unanimous recommendation to remove the proposal from the docket because there has not been adequate time for community review. DPD recommends that Council postpone consideration of this amendment to a future docket cycle to allow sufficient time for Executive staff to develop policy language. DPD notes that outreach to the Ballard community on this amendment has only just begun, making it very unlikely that the community and staff will fully develop a proposal in time for the current amendment cycle.

Also for amendment #8, Planning Commission recommends that the ongoing Interbay/Ballard Land Use Corridor Study is the appropriate venue for evaluating the amendment proposal. The Commission expects that the Study will include a robust community engagement process and consider the amendment in the context of a broader sub-area planning process.

Central Staff finds that consideration of that amendment #8 cannot be practically accomplished during the amendment cycle, and agrees that there is not sufficient time for review and public comment on the amendment before DPD's recommendation in December.

DPD has recommended that amendment #9 be placed on the policy docket. The Planning Commission also recommended that it be placed on the docket, but raised the question of whether additional environmental review would be necessary, particularly to address concerns about the impacts to transportation, public infrastructure, and environmentally sensitive areas that could result from changing the zoning from single family to multifamily.

Central Staff agrees with the Planning Commission that additional environmental review is needed to inform the Council's decision, including an analysis of historic preservation issues. We recommend that amendment #9 be placed on the docket, with the understanding that the applicant must complete robust environmental review in advance of DPD's recommendation to Council in fall 2013. We also recommend that the resolution be amended to note that proposed amendment to the Future Land Use Map will be accompanied by a text amendment to the Seattle Municipal Code regarding a possible exception to the criteria for the single-family designation of the current site under certain limited conditions. The proposed amendment would read as follows, with the new wording double-underlined:

9. Former Battelle research property. Change the Future Land Use Map designation of property bounded on the north by the rear property lines of properties fronting Northeast 45th Street, on the south by Northeast 41st Street, on the west by 38th Avenue Northeast, and on the east by the middle of the block between 41st Avenue Northeast and 42nd Avenue Northeast, formerly occupied by a Battelle research facility, from single family to multifamily. The map amendment will be accompanied by a text amendment to the Seattle Municipal Code regarding a possible exception to the criteria for the single-family designation of the current site under certain limited conditions.

Next Steps

A Full Council vote will likely occur on July 29. After adoption of the resolution, the process for reviewing the amendments on the docket is as follows:

- DPD reviews the proposed amendments, conducts public review as appropriate, and presents its analyses and the Mayor's recommendations to the City Council by December 10, 2013¹;
- PLUS considers DPD's recommendation, conducts a public hearing, discusses the merits of the proposed amendments, and votes on a recommendation to Full Council; and
- Full Council votes on a bill amending the Comprehensive Plan by the end of March 2014.

¹ Rather than November 20, 2013, which is the date called for in Resolution 31117.

| App. # | Applicant | Description of Proposed Amendment | Executive | Planning Commission | Central Staff |
|--------|------------------------------------|--|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| 1 | DPD | DPD proposes amendments to the University Community Urban Center neighborhood plan, including Future Land Use Map (FLUM) changes, placeholders for future policy amendments related to open space, economic development, diversity of housing types, and building form, and amendments to infrastructure and facility data. | Include | Include | Include |
| 2 | Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance (RNA) | The RNA proposes to change the FLUM to expand the boundary of the University Community Urban Center to include the Blessed Sacrament Parish south of Northeast 53 rd Street and east of 8 th Avenue Northeast. | Include | Include | Include |
| 3 | Nancy Bocek and neighbors | Ms. Bocek proposes to change the FLUM to remove the area west of the middle of the block between 9 th Avenue Northeast and 10 th Avenue Northeast and north of Northeast 47 th Street from the University Community Urban Center. | Include | Include | Include |
| 4 | DPD | DPD proposes amendments to the Central Area neighborhood plan, including Future Land Use Map changes and placeholders for future policy amendments. | Include | Include | Include |
| 5 | DPD | DPD proposes amendments to amend the Duwamish Manufacturing/Industrial Center (MIC) and Stadium Transition Area Overlay District, including FLUM amendments and placeholders for policies related to protection of land for industrial uses and whether the Overlay District should be maintained or changed to another zoning category. | Include | Include | Include |

| App. # | Applicant | Description of Proposed Amendment | Executive | Planning Commission | Central Staff |
|--------|---|--|-----------------------|--|---|
| 6 | DPD | DPD proposes to change the FLUM to remove an area west of 16 th Avenue West, east of the railroad tracks, and north of West Dravus Street from the Ballard/Interbay MIC and change the designation from industrial to mixed-use commercial. | Include | Include | Include |
| 7 | Ian Morrison, for Hummel Architects, PC | Mr. Morrison proposes to Amend the FLUM for property south of Armory Way and west of 15 th Avenue West to remove it from Ballard/Interbay MIC and change the designation from industrial to mixed-use commercial. | Include | Include | Include |
| 8 | Ian Morrison, for 1290 Broadway REIT | Mr. Morrison proposes to amend the FLUM for property north of the Ballard Bridge, east of 15 th Avenue West, and south of NW 54 th Street to remove it from the Ballard/Interbay MIC and change the designation from industrial to mixed-use commercial. | Do Not Include | Do Not Include | Do Not Include |
| 9 | Brent Carson, for 4000 Property LLC | Mr. Carson proposes change the FLUM designation of property bounded on the north by Northeast 45th Street and on the west by 38th Avenue Northeast, formerly occupied by a Battelle research facility, from single family to multifamily. | Include | Include , with questions about environmental review | Include , with robust environmental review |